



County Hall
Cardiff
CF10 4UW
Tel: (029) 2087 2000

Neuadd y Sir
Caerdydd
CF10 4UW
Ffôn: (029) 2087 2000

SYLWADAU HWYR

Pwyllgor PWYLLGOR CYNLLUNIO

Dyddiad ac amser y cyfarfod DYDD MERCHER, 16 AWST 2017, 2.30 PM

Os gwelwch yn dda gweler ynghlwm Cynrychiolaeth Atodlen hwyr a dderbyniwyd mewn perthynas â cheisiadau i gael ei benderfynu yn y Pwyllgor Cynllunio hwn

Late Reps (*Tudalennau 1 - 16*)

Mae'r dudalen hon yn cael ei adael yn wag yn fwriadol

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SCHEDULE
PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16th AUGUST 2017

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 16/01852/MNR
ADDRESS:	Uplands Mobiles Limited, 184 North Road, Gabalfa, Cardiff
FROM:	Objector - Iain Claridge 102 Newfoundland Road
SUMMARY:	<p>The Uplands development is of inadequate standard regarding space and comfort and runs counter to the principles of WHQS that are central to the council's housing policy. The reason for its return to the Planning Committee – to further reduce the developers' s106 for affordable housing – should result in the scrapping of the plans and the re-establishment of the principles of on-site affordable housing and full payment of s106 contributions.</p> <p>In addition to objections based on lack of parking provision the proposed development is:-</p> <p>1. An unacceptable over-development of the site as demonstrated by the inadequate size/configuration of two of the flats.</p> <p>The creation of such units is contrary to the Council's own housing policy and Welsh Government standards. Existing Council housing has to achieve Welsh Housing Quality Standard. The Business Plan ensures the maintenance of the WHQS and sets out the Council's objective to deliver "high quality and sustainable housing." The WHQS standards are relevant to private flats because a notable feature of the new Housing Revenue Account Budget Plan is buy-back of private properties. The Council should not permit the creation of private flats of a standard below that of WHQS if it is to be the potential re-purchaser of private flats and houses. Cardiff should not be permitting the creation of private flats with lower space standards than the lowest WHQS examples.</p> <p>2. An unacceptable continuation of Cardiff Council's failure to extract and use Section 106 affordable housing contributions from developers. This proposal is in process of granting a second reduction of s106 contribution. The permission for off-site affordable housing is not sufficiently in-line with stated SPG policy. This will impede the council's Housing Revenue Account Budget Plan 2017-18.</p> <p>The reduced s106 contribution will not add up to the Welsh Government expected costs of a socially rented flat. The SPG sets out the principle of independent verification of a developer's claim of non-viability due to s106 contributions. It is not clear why the full s106 affordable housing contribution not phased or deferred rather than cut.</p>
REMARKS:	The issue of parking provision has been considered previously (see paragraph 8.8 of the Committee Report) and it was resolved, at the

meeting of the Planning Committee on 15/03/2017, to grant planning permission for this development (subject to the signing of a S106 Obligation relating to the provision of a disabled parking bay as well as an off-site affordable housing contribution).

1. The size of the flats has been considered previously (see paragraphs 8.5 and 8.6 of the Committee Report) and the Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission for this development. The plans have not changed since this resolution was made. The Council does not currently have a policy which sets a minimum size for flats in private developments and the Welsh Housing Quality Standards relate only to social housing. The Council does not have a commitment to buy these flats and its inability/unwillingness to do so because of their size or configuration would not have any measurable impact on the supply of Social Housing in the city.

2. Every effort is made to ensure that all developments contribute toward the provision of necessary infrastructure and measures required to mitigate their impact where relevant. The Cardiff Planning Obligations SPG: Edition 1 (26 January 2017) sets out the mechanism for achieving this, and makes it clear that “there may be occasions where development proposals are unable to meet all the relevant policy requirements whilst still remaining viable” and that “Planning obligations are negotiated between the Council and developers on a case by case basis.” Following the procedures set out in the SPG, the Council has sought independent verification, by the District Valuer’s Office, to review the financial appraisal which the developer has provided for this development. This review has concluded that a reduced S106 contribution is justifiable and has provided a figure which is considered to be the maximum that the developer could afford whilst ensuring that the scheme remains viable. The SPG states that, following independent review, “the application will then be considered against the potential under provision or delayed provision of infrastructure (including affordable housing)” and “the Council must determine “whether a development would still be acceptable in planning terms with a reduced level of contribution(s).” In this case, the Housing Strategy Officer has taken into consideration the circumstances of this case and is satisfied that an off-site affordable housing contribution is appropriate and that the reduced amount is acceptable. The proposal is considered to be in line with the council’s adopted Local Development Plan Policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The “full” s106 affordable housing contribution cannot be obtained by phasing or deferment in this case – deferral/phasing of payments would be appropriate in much larger proposals where the development was to be built in phases and would not be appropriate for a small scale development such as this.

PAGE NO. 1	APPLICATION NO. 16/01852/MNR
ADDRESS:	Uplands Mobiles Limited, 184 North Road, Gabalfa, Cardiff
FROM:	Councillor Dr Ashley Wood
SUMMARY:	I would like to object to this application on the grounds of insufficient parking provision and the impact this will have on existing residents. The SPG (Access, Circulation and Parking Standards) provide for a minimum of 3 space for a development such as this proposed, to account for visitors this increases by a further suggested 1.5 spaces (see Pg 25, Table 3.8). The current proposal does not provide for this parking. Whilst non-resident permit parking space is available in the immediate area (e.g. Newfoundland Road) this is often at capacity and is frequently used by residents unable to access permit spaces or when none are available at busy times. Furthermore, whilst the previous commercial use of this site may have contributed to parking demand, the nature of this parking demand is likely to have been shorter duration with greater turnover than what we would expect from the proposed residential use, this will further exacerbate the situation.
REMARKS:	The issue of parking provision has been considered previously (see Highways and Transportation officer's comments at paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 and paragraph 8.8 of the Committee Report) and it was resolved, at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 15/03/2017, to grant planning permission for this development subject to the signing of a S106 Obligation relating to the provision of a disabled parking bay (as well as an off-site affordable housing contribution). Planning policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance have not changed since the application was last reported to the Planning Committee and it remains the case that officers do not consider that the refusal of planning permission on the grounds of insufficient off-street parking provision could be justified.

PAGE NO. 23	APPLICATION NO. 16/2867/MJR
ADDRESS:	CANADIAN HOTEL, 143 PEARL STREET, ADAMSDOWN, CARDIFF, CF24 1PN
FROM:	Councillor Owen Jones
SUMMARY:	I wish to object to the above application on the grounds of the increased traffic and road use that it would bring in what is already a heavily congested area. The current proposal will see 12 apartments with only 4 allocated parking spaces. I believe that the lack of parking provision is a major concern as it is clear that more than 4 residents will be using a car.

	<p>Parking spaces are already at a premium in the area, and I hope that the wider picture is taken into account when a decision is taken.</p> <p>Pearl St, Broadway and the streets that connect them are already at capacity when it comes to parking. Not only have many traditional properties been turned into HMO's (a problem that I accept is common to many streets in Cardiff), but these streets are used for a multitude of purposes. Broadway has many businesses and several local garages use the streets to keep vehicles that are awaiting repairs. Also, this area of Adamsdown is home to number of places of worship. Pearl St. has the Sikh Gurdwara Temple that hosts Sikhs from across the city and Cecil St. has the Al Iklas Mosque. These multitude of uses mean that parking spaces are used throughout both the day and night.</p> <p>I would also like to draw attention to other larger constructions that will add to the strain. While the old Bingo hall and the Citadel are at the far end of Pearl St, the two current planning proposals intend to bring around 50 new apartments to the area. Some parking is indeed allocated, but this influx will inevitably have a knock on affect all the way down the street. Cramming so many properties into such a relatively small space can only be to the detriment of the local residents.</p> <p>If permission is granted then it must be a condition that no resident of the new build will be able to apply for a resident permit. I also believe that more resident parking should be allocated for the current residents, not just on Bradley Street, but on the streets surrounding, as the area should be seen as a whole and not as individual streets.</p>
<p>REMARKS:</p>	<p>That the comments are noted and addressed Paragraphs 5.1, 8.5 and 8.7 of the Committee Report.</p> <p>The Transportation Officer confirms that under current policy, that the residents of the new flats would not qualify for resident parking permits, and requests for a financial contribution to investigate the potential for further traffic management orders in the area which may include for an extension of the existing scheme.</p> <p>Additional Recommendation:</p> <p>Recommendation 7:</p> <p>That the vendor/landlord of the property make clear to potential purchasers/tenants, that occupation of the flats would not provide a right to a resident parking permit.</p>

PAGE NO. 41	APPLICATION NO. 17/111MJR
ADDRESS:	199-209 CITY ROAD, ROATH, CARDIFF, CF24 3JD
FROM:	Cllr McGarry, Cllr Lent, Cllr De'Ath and Cllr Wong
SUMMARY:	<p>I notice that, in the Report going to Planning Committee, it states that no further comments have come from us since the latest amended plans. Would it be possible to update the Committee that we have not withdrawn our objection because the updated plans do not address our concerns.</p> <p>We have already objected to this Application, both the original one and the amended plans, and our objections still stand. We do not consider that any of our concerns have been addressed in the further amended plans.</p>
REMARKS:	The objections raised by Local Ward Members are identified in paragraph 7.2 of the Committee Report, and considered in Paragraph 8.6 of the Analysis Section.

PAGE NO. 41	APPLICATION NO. 17/111MJR
ADDRESS:	199-209 CITY ROAD, ROATH, CARDIFF, CF24 3JD
FROM:	Cllr McGarry
SUMMARY:	<p>I see, from the Report, that it is suggested that a financial contribution of about 70k should be made to go towards 'open spaces' in the locality. Our ward has very little open space and there is no scope for providing any more: If planning officers saw Roath Park on a sunny day in the spring/summer they would see that every square foot of grass is taken up with students and others sun-bathing/picnicking etc. How can a financial contribution help provide open spaces for all these extra students? Planning officers really need to be telling developers to provide recreational open space within the development</p>
REMARKS:	The comments are noted. The financial contribution stated by the Parks Officer was a (maximum) calculation based on the approved SPG (Planning Obligations) for a development where there is no on-site provision. The application does provide an internal amenity space for the future residents. The amended plans do not allow motorised vehicles to access the space, which provides both a better environment for residents, and an improved aspect from internal facing windows. Condition 5 is recommended to agree a detailed landscaping plan prior to commencement of development.

PAGE NO. 66	APPLICATION NO. 17/224/ MJR
ADDRESS:	FORMER CARDIFF BAY STATION
FROM:	Council's Ecologist
SUMMARY:	Suggests further conditions:
REMARKS:	<p>That the following conditions be added to the recommendation :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition: If works do not commence within 12 months of the most recent survey for bats [before July 2018], or, once started, be suspended for any reason for a period greater than 12 months in duration, the potential for the presence of protected species should be reassessed, and no works shall commence or be restarted before a further survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The survey should i) establish if there have been any changes in the presence and/or abundance of bats; ii) identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes; propose appropriate mitigation if there have been any changes, and a timetable for their implementation . <p>Reason: To ensure that the assessment of the impacts of the development upon the species concerned, and any measures to mitigate those impacts, are informed by up-to-date information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition: Prior to the commencement of works on site, including any hard or soft stripping of the building fabric, the applicant shall provide for an ecologist to brief all contractors as in respect of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Giving tool-box talks to site operatives such that they are aware that bats may be present</i> ○ <i>'soft-stripping' of features such as roof tiles, soffits, barge-boards, fascias etc, and any other features which bats may use to roost or to access a roost</i> ○ <i>Having an ecologist on call in case bats are found during works. If bats are found, work should stop immediately and Natural Resources Wales contacted for advice</i> ○ <i>Incorporating enhancement measures for bats, such as bat bricks, bat tiles or providing bat access to roof voids, as advised by the applicant's ecological consultant</i> <p>Reason: To ensure that appropriate measures are employed to ensure that no protected species will be harmed as a consequence of the proposals in the unlikely event that such species have avoided previous detection.</p>

--	--

PAGE NO. 66	APPLICATION NO. 17/224/ MJR
ADDRESS:	FORMER CARDIFF BAY STATION
FROM:	Housing Manager
SUMMARY:	Notes that no independent viability appraisal has been submitted, but that in the given circumstances understands/appreciates the recommendation of the report.
REMARKS:	Noted

PAGE NO. 66	APPLICATION NO. 17/224/ MJR
ADDRESS:	FORMER CARDIFF BAY STATION
FROM:	Network Rail
SUMMARY:	<p>Note that the amended proposals omit / remove the external fire escape staircase from the rear (northern) elevation of the property and confirm that NR therefore have no objection in principle to the proposal.</p> <p>Comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of NR's adjoining land are provided in respect of drainage, foundations, mitigation of noise and vibration, plant, scaffolding and cranes, maintenance of NR access points, ground disturbance, party walls and NR asset protection.</p>
REMARKS:	Noted. Items reasonably controlled by planning appear as conditions within the recommendation. Other matters will be by private undertaking between NR and the Applicant; or will fall to be considered under alternation regulations. The comments have been forwarded to the applicant for information.

PAGE NO. 66/97	APPLICATION NO. 17/224/MJR and 17/225/MJR
ADDRESS:	FORMER CARDIFF BAY STATION
FROM:	Victorian Society
SUMMARY:	Maintain significant concerns, absence of a heritage assessment, or any substantive justification for highly damaging interventions and the extension proposed. They suggest that if the application is not withdrawn then the application then it should be refused consent.
REMARKS:	These matters are dealt with in the report. The works to the station

	are fundamentally repair works to the remaining structure. There are no historic features of interest remaining in the building which is listed more for its historical importance than its architectural importance. The views of the Victorian Society in respect of the design of the extension are noted but not concurred with, The degree of intervention to enable the two elements of the scheme to come together are minimal and potentially reversible if necessary in the future.
--	--

PAGE NO. 66/97	APPLICATION NO. 17/224/MJR and 17/225/MJR
ADDRESS:	FORMER CARDIFF BAY STATION
FROM:	Michael Gooch
SUMMARY:	<p>While I accept that the renovation of the existing Listed Building should be given considerable weight, it would be meaningless and counter-productive to approve an extension whose design would <i>clearly</i> harm the visual and historic significance of the building, thereby eroding any potential benefits of securing the building's retention.</p> <p>Consequently, as it is recognised that additional, enabling development would likely be needed to make renovation of the Listed Building's viable, I accept an extension to the building in principle. However, it is obvious that the proposed design falls well short of what could be considered an appropriate or sensitive addition to an important (Grade-II*) historic asset.</p> <p>It is a glaring and incredible omission that the Council's own Conservation team have not provided any comments in relation to the application. In terms of external consultee responses, it is also extremely telling that each of The Association for Industrial Archaeology, The Victorian Society and The Ancient Monuments Society have all objected to the proposals on the basis that the development would cause significant and demonstrable harm both to a Grade-II* Listed Building and the Cardiff Bay Conservation Area. For Officers to simply state, without corroborating evidence or technical advice from the Council's Conservation team, that the comments of three distinct heritage bodies "<i>are noted but not concurred with</i>", is entirely inappropriate.</p> <p>In terms of planning policy, I would reiterate that LDP Policy KP5 requires new development to respond to the "<i>local character and context of the built and landscape setting so that layout, scale, form, massing, height, density, colour, materials, detailing and impact on the built and natural heritage are all addressed within development proposals...</i>", while LDP Policy KP17 clearly states that heritage assets will be "<i>protected, managed and enhanced, in particular</i></p>

	<p><i>the character and setting of its... Listed Buildings (and) Conservation Areas."</i></p> <p>The Committee Report also makes no consideration of the impacts on the Mount Stuart Conservation Area, while Planning Policy Wales, which is a material consideration in these applications and states , has not been considered within the report. Local Planning Authorities also have a general, statutory duty to <i>"have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."</i> (Section 66 (1), Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).</p> <p>As a Grade-II* Listed Building (particularly important buildings of more than special interest), it is beyond demonstrable that the proposed design achieves none of these requirements, utilising materials, proportions and features that in no way enhance the character or setting of the Listed Building or Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Committee Report explicitly states that the <i>"aesthetic of the proposed building is intentionally in distinct contrast to the language of the existing building."</i> It therefore cannot be reasonably said that the proposals would either respect or enhance the building or its setting, which would be reduced in prominence by virtue of the proposed extension.</p> <p>Consequently, although the proposal's retention and renovation of the existing dwelling is indeed welcomed, the proposed design of the modern extension is unequivocally out of keeping with the Listed Building or its context. Indeed, if a development in such <i>"distinct contrast"</i> to a Grade-II* Listed Building were to be considered acceptable, it poses the question as to the purpose of LDP Policies KP5 and KP17, which would be rendered effectively redundant.</p> <p>I therefore object to the application and would suggest that there is a likely and significant risk that the Council would be acting unlawfully if the application were to be approved with its present design, which would be open to judicial review.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>The extent to which the design would harm the visual and historic significance of the building, and any potential benefit of securing its retention is subjective.</p> <p>Officers and members of planning committee can only recommend/determine such proposals as are placed before them.</p> <p>The Grade-II* status of the building is recognised within the report.</p> <p>The head of Planning's report incorporates the comments of the department's conservation staff/design team</p>

	<p>The objections of the Association for Industrial Archaeology, Victorian Society, and Ancient Monuments Society's observations have been reported and are not concurred with for the reasons contained within the reports.</p> <p>Relevant Planning policy is cited in the report.</p> <p>The proposal preserves the Listed Building, has an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area in this location, and does not impact on any special features of the building.</p> <p>The proposed extension will impact on the setting of the building but this is adequately reasoned within the reports and is subject to past precedent.</p> <p>Contrast is deemed an acceptable, and often used, response to the extension of a listed building of a particular architectural aesthetic.</p> <p>The lawfulness of the procedures followed in making the recommendation provided to Planning Committee are considered Lawful.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 166	APPLICATION NO. 17/1206/MJR
ADDRESS:	LAND ADJACENT TO CEFN EURWG, DRUIDSTONE ROAD, OLD ST MELLONS
FROM:	Denis & Susan Harrington
SUMMARY:	<p>Having viewed the Officer's report the Applicants have requested consideration be given to the following matters :</p> <p>Item 5i : Proposed 2 detached dwellings on land adjacent to Cefn Eurwg, Druidstone Road, Old St Mellons.</p> <p>One of the items on your agenda for Wednesday's meeting is an outline proposal for an infill plot on Druidstone Road in St Mellons. I am the applicant for the scheme which proposes two new homes and has a reference of 17/1206/MNR (which I believe means it is a minor application).</p> <p>Your officer's report makes it clear that there is no technical or environmental objection to the scheme, and that it will make contribution of over £75,000 towards the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>It also describes the site quite well by calling it secluded and screened and confirms that it sits between two developed parcels of land, on a road that has seen a lot of change. Later on the report</p>

	<p>says that the site is in a sustainable location as well.</p> <p>Unfortunately because it lies on the wrong side of a policy line - a settlement limit - officers say it is in the open countryside where development should be resisted.</p> <p>National Policy says that schemes can be approved beyond settlement limits (there cannot be just one type of countryside) but officers feel constrained. For this reason the application is recommended for refusal.</p> <p>We think that it is obvious that the site is not in the open countryside - and the aerial photograph at the end of the report shows why. On this basis - and because the scheme is acceptable in all other respects - we respectfully ask you to approve the scheme.</p> <p>We also think that a visit to the site might be particularly useful as it would let you see "on the ground" that the site is in reality an infill plot that will not result in any intrusion into the countryside and why, the flexible approach recommended in National Policy can and should apply.</p> <p>I hope you will agree to this as we think it would be a little time very well spent.</p>
REMARKS:	Noted

PAGE NO. 182	APPLICATION NO. 17/1453/MJR
ADDRESS:	WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL
FROM:	Head of Planning
SUMMARY:	The applicant has submitted revised landscaping plans. The Tree Officer has no objections to the submitted details. This necessitates a change to the reference numbers on 5 of the drawings identified in condition 2 and two additional documents Trees Hedgerow Native Details and Landscaping Planting Methodology Aftercare to be identified in condition 2.
REMARKS:	<p>Recommendation - Amend condition 2 to read:-</p> <p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:</p> <p>1205_PDA_ZZ_00_DR_A_05_0003 Rev P03 (Location Plan) 1205_PDA_ZZ_00_DR_A_05_0004 Rev P18 (Site Plan) 1205_PDA_V4_00_DR_A_05_0005 Rev P08 (Ground Floor Plan) 1205_PDA_V4_01_DR_A_05_0006 Rev P10 (First Floor Plan)</p>

	<p>1205_PDA_V4_RF_DR_A_05_0007 Rev P04 (Roof Plan)</p> <p>1205_PDA_V1_ZZ_DR_A_05_0008 Rev P05 (Main Building Elevations)</p> <p>1205_PDA_V2_ZZ_DR_A_05_0012 Rev P05 (Sports Hall Elevations)</p> <p>1205_PDA_V3_ZZ_DR_A_05_0016 Rev P04 (Post 16 Elevations)</p> <p>1205_PDA_ZZ_ZZ_DR_A_05_0019 Rev P04 (Existing Site Sections)</p> <p>1205_PDA_ZZ_ZZ_DR_A_05_0020 Rev P05 (Proposed Site Sections)</p> <p>1205_PDA_V4_00_DR_A_05_0026 Rev P03 (Bin Store)</p> <p>1205_PDA_V4_XX_DR_A_90_0976 Rev P01 (Proposed Cycle Shelters)</p> <p>1205-CAM V4 00 DR C 90-0127 Rev.P4 (Swept Path Analysis Sheet 1)</p> <p>1205-CAM V4 00 DR C 90-0128 Rev.P4 (Swept Path Analysis Sheet 2)</p> <p>1205-CAM V4 00 DR C 90-0129 Rev.P4 Swept Path Analysis Sheet 3)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0001-P005 (Landscape Existing)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0002-P006 (Landscape Clearance Tree Works)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0003-P004 (Landscape Overall)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0004-P003 (Landscape Planting Details)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0005-P003 (Landscape Planting Schedule)</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0006-P001 Trees Hedgerow Native Details</p> <p>1205-COR-ZZ-XX-SP-L-XX-0007 Landscaping Planting Methodology Aftercare</p> <p>1205-MCP-V5-XX-DR-E-32-3202 Rev P06 (Lighting Strategy)</p> <p>1205-MCP-V5-XX-DR-E-32-3203 Rev P04 (External Lighting and Power Layout)</p> <p>Design and Access Statement by Powell Dobson; Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Rev P02 (Willmott Dixon); Surface and Foul Drainage Strategy (Cambria: April 2017); Flood Consequences Assessment (Atkins: January 2017); Acoustic Survey Report (Atkins: January 2017); Noise Impact Assessment of Sports Pitches (Mach Acoustics: June 2017); Acoustic Façade Assessment (Mach Acoustics: June 2017); Arboricultural Report (ArbTS: 20 December 2016), Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (First Ecology: June 2017); Phase 1 Extended Habitat Survey (David Clements Ecology Ltd: January 2017); Ecological Appraisal (First Ecology: June 2017); Interim Ecological Update (First Ecology: June 2017); Ecological Appraisal (First Ecology: July 2017); Soil Resources Survey and Plan (Land Research Associates: July 2017); Site Investigation</p>
--	---

	<p>Report (Atkins: January 2014); Supplementary Site Investigation Report (Johnson, Poole and Bloomer Land Consultants: July 2017); Archaeological and Geophysical Survey (TerraDat: January 2017); Updated Geophysical Survey (Sumo Services Ltd: May 2017); Project Design for Archaeological Evaluation (Headland Archaeology: June 2017); Archaeological Evaluation Report (Headland Archaeology: July 2017); Archaeological Watching Brief (Headland Archaeology: July 2017); Heritage Assessment (EDP Ltd: June 2017); Transport Assessment (Cardiff Council: July 2016); Travel Plan (Atkins: June 2017); and, Low and Zero Carbon Technology Feasibility Study (McCann and Partners: March 2017).</p> <p>Reason: To avoid doubt and confusion as to the approved plans and documents.</p>
--	---

PAGE NO. 182	APPLICATION NO. 17/1453/MJR
ADDRESS:	WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL
FROM:	Natural Resources Wales
SUMMARY:	<p>Proposed paths and a sitting area in the woodland are now shown on the landscape proposals. In order for us to provide advice with regard to EPS (bats and dormice) we seek clarification as to the works to be undertaken in the woodland, including removal of habitat suitable for bats and dormice to create the path and sitting area, as well as any works required for new access, means of enclosure, acoustic screens within/bounding the woodland. Where works are proposed that will affect habitats suitable for EPS (bats and dormice), surveys will be need to be undertaken by an appropriately qualified, experienced and licenced ecologist in accordance with published guidelines and should be submitted as part of the planning application. This advice is reflected in the Ecological Appraisal by First Ecology dated July 2017. If EPS are likely to be affected by the proposed development, full details of the mitigation that will be put in place should also be submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>The agent has responded stating:</p> <p>In relation to the woodland area to the south of the site the following works are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of an acoustic fence line along the southern boundary to counter noise from the A4232 • The re-installation of a boundary fence line along the eastern boundary • The construction of informal mulch pathways using existing trackway so the area can be used for educational purposes • The creation of two glades; one educational area on the northern boundary and one within the centre of the woodland

	<p>to improve biodiversity value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Woodland Management Plans • The retention of the majority of trees with removal being confined to the removal of low quality scrub. • Ecological Enhancements in the form of bird and bat boxes and the creation of new habitat areas. <p>Significant consideration has been given to this area of the site and the need to ensure that the ecology of the site is investigated and addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological surveys are currently being undertaken for bats and dormice. They are being conducted in accordance with best practice standards but due to the seasons results and recommendations are likely to be available later in the year. • Should Protected Species be found to be present on site, the surveys will also include mitigation and compensation measures to ensure the protection of these species. <p>The developer suggests a condition to address this issue.</p>
REMARKS:	<p>Amend condition 14 to read :</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of the development, including any fencing works, associated with the woodland to the south of the application site (the area parallel to the A4232) ecological surveys shall be completed and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should European Protected Species be found to be present the surveys shall include appropriate mitigation measures. The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and prior to the commencement of the woodland works.</p> <p>Reason In the interest of biodiversity and to retain favourable conservation status.</p>

PAGE NO. 182	APPLICATION NO. 17/1453/MJR
ADDRESS:	WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL
FROM:	Head of Planning
SUMMARY:	The amended site plan indicates a short length of retaining wall close to and in front of the sixth form block but no details of its height and materials have been submitted. Whilst it is anticipated that such a wall will be of a modest height it is considered appropriate to add a further condition.
REMARKS:	Add condition 33 to read:

	<p>Prior to any work commencing on the construction of the retaining wall next to the sixth form block details of its height and external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the retaining wall shall be constructed as approved.</p> <p>Reason : In the interests of visual amenity.</p>
--	--

PAGE NO. 225	APPLICATION NO. 17/1460/MJR
ADDRESS:	PART OF LAND AT 16 PORTHAMAL ROAD, RHIWBINA, CARDIFF, CF14 6AR
FROM:	Gemma Cooksley, 39 Ty Wern Avenue, Rhiwbina, Cardiff
SUMMARY:	<p>Objections have been received from the occupier of the above address, in summary the reasons for objection are as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment of the site • Loss of amenity space to the existing bungalow and the proposed new house • Un-neighbourly development • Spacing • The design is totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties in the area. • The design goes against the character of the avenue which is all 1930's bay fronted terraces. • The design is out of keeping with the area which is predominately terraced houses. • The design is detrimental to the street scene. <p>The occupier's concerns are similar in many respects to those outlined in paragraph 7.8 of the Committee Report from another occupier of the property.</p>
REMARKS:	Noted